

REMARKS

Pending Claims

Claims 1-14, 16-21, 23-25 and 29 are now pending in this application, claim 30 having been withdrawn from consideration and claims 26-28 having been cancelled herein without prejudice. Claims 17-21, 23-25 and 29 have been rejected as obvious. Reconsideration of claims 17-21, 23-25 and 29 is respectfully requested in view of the remarks herein.

Allowed Claims

Claims 1-14 and 16 have been indicated as allowable.

Rejections of the Claims

The Office Action dated April 4, 2003 August 13, 2002 rejected under 35 U.S. C. §103(a), claims 17-19, 21, 24, and 25 as obvious over Miller in view of Givens, Borquist, or Parish, claim 23 as obvious further in view of Matsuoka, claims 17, 19, and 20 as obvious over Jenkins further in view of Givens, Borgquist, or Parish, and claim 29 as obvious over Miller in view of Matsuoka.

Fundamentally, each of these rejections is based upon a water based barrier system (Miller and Jenkins) in view of an air based system (Givens, Borquist, Parish, and Matsuoka). As previously asserted, however, the properties of air and water are fundamentally different, calling for fundamentally different treatment. In response to the argument, the Office Action merely states that the arguments "are not at all persuasive," but does not address the fundamental differences between air and water.

For a given mass, water has a definite volume independent of the shape of the container. Water is relatively incompressible in that any change in the volume of water due to pressure changes is negligible such that it is ignored for most engineering applications. In sharp contrast, gases, such as air, are relatively compressible and their volume will vary to fill the vessel containing it. Thus, gases are particularly susceptible to great build-ups in pressure, particularly in the filling process. As a result, the subject pressure relief valves would be of particular use in the pneumatic systems.


In re Appln. of Clement
Application No. 09/622,013

The results of equations governing the properties and characteristics of a bladder filled with air and one filled with water are radically different. That being the case, it is respectfully submitted that one would not look to pneumatic art when considering a hydraulic system of this sort. Most telling in this regard is the fact that none of the hydraulic references upon which the Office Action relies include such pressure relief valves, and the Office Action must resort to references covering pneumatic systems for the rejection. As a result, the combination of these references is considered improper, and the applicant requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call Pamela J. Ruschau, Registration No. 34242, at the number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,



Pamela J. Ruschau, Reg. No. 34242
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: October 6, 2003